

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

MICHAEL GLOVER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 05-C-869

**CAPTAIN STEVEN HAFERMAN, BILL MCCREEDY,
MATTHEW J. FRANK, JAMES GREER,
MICHAEL DITTMANN, DAVID TARR,
TIMOTHY IMMEL, DR. ELSA HORN,
DEBRA PALM, WARDEN LARRY JENKINS,
HAYLEY HERMANN, and SERGEANT SCOTT JABER,**

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Michael Glover, who is incarcerated at Waupun Correctional Institution, filed this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court granted the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on Eighth Amendment medical care and retaliation claims. The plaintiff has filed several motions which will be addressed herein.

On March 6, 2006, the plaintiff filed Motion for Rule 34 Production of Documents Responding to Defendants' Response to Original Complaint. This document, while labeled a motion, is actually a response to several of the affirmative defenses set forth in the defendants' answer. The filing does not request any action from the court. Accordingly, it will be denied as moot.

On March 20, 2006, the plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to complete discovery. He seeks a 30-day extension to the March 27, 2006, deadline for the completion of

discovery so that the defendants can timely file responses to the plaintiff's March 6, 2006, discovery requests.

On March 28, 2006, the plaintiff filed Supplemental Motion for Discovery, which is essentially a production of documents request. This filing requests certain documents from the defendants. However, on April 12, 2006, the defendants filed a letter indicating that they would not be responding to this discovery request because it was untimely. Pursuant to the scheduling order, the plaintiff's motion is untimely and therefore it will be denied.

On April 20, 2006, the plaintiff filed a request for enlargement of time so that the defendants may have the required 30 days to respond to the plaintiff's request for documents. According to the plaintiff, he needs to conduct discovery in this case so that he can file a dispositive motion and/or respond to a dispositive motion.

The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on April 28, 2006. In spite of this, the *pro se* plaintiff should be granted additional time to complete discovery before being required to respond to the defendants' motion. Accordingly, the plaintiff's April 20, 2006, motion for enlargement of time will be granted. (His March 20, 2006, motion for extension of time is therefore not necessary and will be denied as moot.) The plaintiff will be granted additional time until **July 10, 2006**, to complete discovery. He will then have until **August 10, 2006**, to file a response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for production of documents (Docket #36) is **denied as moot**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for extension of time (Docket #40) is **denied**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for discovery (Docket #41) is **denied**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for extension of time (Docket #44) is **granted**. The plaintiff is granted additional time until **July 10, 2006**, to complete discovery. He will then have until **August 10, 2006**, to file a response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 12th day of May, 2006.

SO ORDERED,

s/Rudolph T. Randa

HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA

Chief Judge